



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,411	03/12/2007	Robert Blumenthal	59526(47992)	1153

21874 7590 05/11/2010
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP
P.O. BOX 55874
BOSTON, MA 02205

EXAMINER

WANG, SHENGJUN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1627

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/11/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/582,411

Applicant(s)

BLUMENTHAL ET AL.

Examiner

Shengjun Wang

Art Unit

1627

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 February 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2, 3, 5, 19-22 and 34-36 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, 6-18 and 23-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/9/2006.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 2, 3, 5, 19-22 withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on February 2, 2010.

2. Applicant's election without traverse of invention group I, and N-(4-

hydroxyphenyl)retinamide (4-HPR) in the reply filed on February 2, 2010 is acknowledged.

3. The claims have been examined insofar as they read on the elected invention and species.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 1, 4, 6-18, 23-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for inhibiting (decrease) HIV viral infection, does not reasonably provide enablement for preventing such viral infection. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

6. The instant specification fails to provide information that would allow the skilled artisan to practice the instant invention without undue experimentation. Attention is directed to In re Wands, 8 USPQ 2d 1400 (CAFC 1988) at 1404 where the court set forth the eight factor to consider when assessing if a disclosure would have required undue experimentation. Citing Ex parte Forman, 230 USPQ 546 (BdApl 1986) at 547 the court recited eight factors:

1) the quantity of experimentation necessary,

- 2) the amount of direction or guidance provided,
- 3) the presence of absence of working examples,
- 4) the nature of the invention,
- 5) the state of the prior art,
- 6) the relative skill of those in the art,
- 7) the predictability of the art, and
- 8) the breadth of the claims.

The claim recites the preventing of viral infections. The application provides examples shows that, in vitro, cells treated with 4-HPR (a retinoid compound) increase the resistance to infection by HIV, (see, particularly, examples 4-6), thereby provides reasonable support for treating, or decrease the viral infection. However, the application provides no further guidance, direction, and working examples with respect to the prevention of viral infection. The state of the prior art indicates that preventions of viral infections are very difficult, if not possible. Successful examples are limited to immunization, or physical separation (e.g. condom). No small organic molecules are known to be effective for preventing viral infection. See, e.g., Stephenson, "New HIV prevention strategies Urged." The art for preventing viral infection is very unpredictable. It is noted that the pharmaceutical art generally is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity, The court in *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839; 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970) held that, "in case involving unpredictable factors, such as most chemical reactions and physiological activity, the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved." The more unpredictable an area, the

more specific enablement is need in order to satisfy the statute. Applicants fail to provide information allowing skilled artisan to ascertain these methods without undue experimentation.

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

9. Claims 30 and 33 recite the limitation "RNA virus". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

10. Claim 33 recites the limitation "sphingomyelinase". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

11. Claims 31 and 32 recite "wherein the N-(ary)retinamide compound inhibits HIV infectivity at a *concentration*..." The claim and specification provide no clear definition for the "concentration". It is note, the specification disclosed an in vitro model in which a solution containing 4-HPR is contacted with the cells. The claims, however, read on in vivo. It is not clear if the concentration refers to the concentration in the pharmaceutical composition, or the concentration in serum (wherein the compound actually contact the cells)?

12. A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. See MPEP § 2173.05(c). Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is

followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 33 recites the broad recitation at least 50%, and the claim also recites 99.9% up to 100%, which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 1, 4, 6-18, 23-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maciazek et al. in view of Gander (US 4,323,581).

15. Maciazek et al. teaches that Retinoid-induced repression of HIV core promoter activity inhibits virus replication. Retinoid particularly inhibit the infection of cells. Further it is known that the rate of mother to child transmission of HIV-1, progression to AIDS from HIV-1 infection, and AIDS-associated mortality are all inversely correlated with serum vitamin A levels. Maciazek particularly teaches that retinol or its metabolite repress HIV-1 replication. See, particularly, the abstract, pages 5863-5866.

16. Maciazek et al. do not teach expressly the employment of 4-HPR for treating HIV infection or for inhibiting HIV infection to cells.

17. However, Gander et al. teaches that 4-HPR is a retinoid derivative, with the function of retinoids, but with low systemic toxicity. See, particularly, col. 1, line 38 to col. 2, line 53.

Therefore, it would have been prima facie obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the claimed the invention was made, to use 4-HPR as a retinoid for treating HIV infection or for inhibiting HIV infection of cells.

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use 4-HPR as a retinoid for treating HIV infection or for inhibiting HIV infection of cells because 4-HPR is a known retinoids derivative with low systemic toxicity. As to the functional limitations “inhibiting a viral attachment/entry or exit phase of a virus” recited in claim 23, note, the recitation has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951). Further, the instant claims are directed to affecting a biochemical pathway with old and well known compounds. The argument that such claims are not directed to the old and well known ultimate utility (inhibiting HIV infection in cell) for the compounds, e.g., retinoid compounds, are not probative. It is well settled patent law that mode of action elucidation does not impart patentable moment to otherwise old and obvious subject matter. Applicant’s attention is directed to *In re Swinehart*, (169 USPQ 226 at 229) where the

Court of Customs and Patent Appeals stated “is elementary that the mere recitation of a newly discovered function or property, inherently possessed by thing in the prior art, does not cause a claim drawn to those things to distinguish over the prior art.” In the instant invention, the claims are directed to the ultimate utility set forth in the prior art, albeit distanced by various biochemical intermediates. The ultimate utility for the claimed compounds is old and well known rendering the claimed subject matter obvious to the skilled artisan. It would follow therefore that the instant claims are properly rejected under 35 USC 103. Furthermore, the further employment of other known anti-HIV agents for the treatment of HIV infection would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, as it is prima facie obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught in the prior art to be useful for same purpose in order to form third composition that is to be used for very the same purpose; idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in prior art; thus, the claimed invention which is a combination of two known anti-HIV agents sets forth prima facie obvious subject matter. See In re Kerkhoven, 205 USPQ 1069. Finally, the optimization of a result effective parameter, e.g., effective amount of a therapeutic agent, is considered within the skill of the artisan. See, In re Boesch and Slaney (CCPA) 204 USPQ 215.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shengjun Wang whose telephone number is (571) 272-0632. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan, can be reached on (571) 272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Shengjun Wang/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1627